

REMARKS

Summary

Claims 21-24 and 26-37 stand in this application. Claims 1-20, 25 and 38 have been canceled without prejudice. Claims 21, 26, 30 and 34 have been amended. No new matter has been added. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the standing claims are respectfully requested.

Although Applicant disagrees with the broad grounds of rejection set forth in the Office Action, Applicant has amended claims 21, 26, 30 and 34 in order to facilitate prosecution on the merits.

Objections to the Claims

Claims 21-25 and 26-29 stand objected to. Claims 21 and 26 have been amended to correct the minor informalities. Therefore, withdrawal of the claim objections is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 21-23, 25-28, 30-32, 34-36 and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,188,898 to Phillips (hereinafter “Phillips”) in view of United States Publication No. 2003/0235167 to Kuffner (hereinafter “Kuffner”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 24, 29, 33 and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,188,898 to Phillips (hereinafter “Phillips”) in view of United States Publication No. 2003/0235167 to Kuffner (hereinafter “Kuffner”) and further in view of United States Patent No. 6,167,032 to Allison et al. (hereinafter “Allison”). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection, and requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references, taken alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest every element recited in claims 21-24 and 26-37. Therefore claims 21-24 and 26-37 define over the cited references whether taken alone or

in combination. For example, claim 21 has been amended to recite the following language, in relevant part:

a beacon transceiver to transmit a beacon to a remote device and to receive a reply from the remote device, wherein a beacon transmitted by said beacon transceiver provides an indication of the one or more available radio communication protocols and a received reply from the remote device provides an indication of a desired radio communication protocol.

According to the Office Action, the missing language is disclosed by Phillips at column 3, lines 20-25 and column 2, lines 1-5. Applicant respectfully disagrees.

Applicant respectfully submits that Phillips fails to disclose the missing language of the claimed subject matter. For example, Phillips at the given cites, in relevant part, teaches:

...the network including a plurality of multimode base stations each capable of operating selectively in at least some of said operating protocols and each having means for interrogating a said mobile terminal so as to determine that terminal's operating protocol....

In the network of FIG. 1, the base stations operate at appropriate frequencies to provide a communications service and also provide a beacon function for those mobile communications protocols that require such a function. For example, the system may provide access to mobile terminals using the GSM 900, DECT, and DCS 1800 protocols. It will be understood that this group of protocols is by no means exclusive and that other existing or future protocols can be accommodated.

Applicant submits that this is different than the above recited language of amended independent claim 21.

Applicant submits that the cited portions of Phillips, arguably, teach means for determining a terminal's operating protocols where the protocols may include GSM 900, DECT and DCS 1800. Applicant submits, however, that they have been unable to locate any teaching in Phillips directed to a beacon transceiver to transmit a beacon to a remote device...wherein a beacon transmitted by said beacon transceiver provides an indication

of the one or more available radio communication protocols... as recited in amended independent claim 21.

By way of contrast, Applicant submits that Phillips actually teaches away from the use of a beacon transmitting by the base station to initiate communications between a base station and a mobile terminal. More particularly, Phillips at column 3, lines 35-55, arguably teaches that a mobile terminal initiates a call and emits a request for service which is used by the network and/or a base station to determine the appropriate protocol to establish a call between the mobile terminal and the base station. Applicant submits that this is clearly different than the above recited language of amended independent claim 21 that includes a beacon first sent to a remote device by a wireless access point.

Applicant submits that they have been unable to locate at least the above recited language of amended independent claim 21 in the teaching of Phillips. Therefore, Phillips fails to disclose, teach or suggest the missing language. Furthermore, Applicant submits that Kuffner and Allison also fail to teach at least the above recited missing language. Consequently, the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose, teach or suggest every element recited in claim 21.

For at least these reasons, Applicant submits that claim 21 is patentable over the cited references, whether taken alone or in combination. In addition, claims 26, 30 and 34 have been amended to recite features similar to those recited in claim 21. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 26, 30 and 34 are not obvious and are patentable over the cited references for reasons analogous to those presented with respect to claim 21. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 21, 26, 30 and 34.

Furthermore, if an independent claim is non-obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103, then any claim depending therefrom is non-obvious. *See MPEP § 2143.03*, for example. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the obviousness rejection with respect to claims 22-24, 27-29, 31-33 and 35-37 that depend from claims 21, 26, 30 and 34 respectively, and therefore contain additional features that further distinguish these claims from the cited references.

Conclusion

It is believed that claims 21-24 and 26-37 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a timely Notice of Allowance to this effect is earnestly solicited. Applicants do not otherwise concede, however, the correctness of the Office Action's rejection with respect to any of the limitations of the independent claims and dependent claims discussed above. Accordingly, Applicants hereby reserve the right to make additional arguments as may be necessary to further distinguish the claims from the cited references, taken alone or in combination, based on additional features contained in the independent or dependent claims that were not discussed above. A detailed discussion of these differences is believed to be unnecessary at this time in view of the basic differences in the independent claims pointed out above.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned to discuss any matter concerning this application.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or § 1.17 to the Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,
KACVINSKY LLC

/Andrew H. Aurand/

Andrew H. Aurand, Reg. No. 61,875
Under 37 CFR 1.34(a)

Dated: July 28, 2009

KACVINSKY LLC
C/O CPA Global
P.O. Box 52050
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(724) 933-5529